

### **REMARKS**

This Amendment is in response to the Final Office Action mailed February 10, 2006. In the Office Action, claims 13-16, 30-33 and 47-50 were objected and identified as including patentable subject matter. Claims 1-12, 17-29, 34-46 and 51 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection and respectfully request reconsideration of the pending claims based on the remarks made herein.

#### ***Allowable Subject Matter***

Applicants note with appreciation the Examiner's indication of allowable subject matter. The Examiner objects to claims 13-16, 30-33 and 47-50 as being dependent on a rejected base claim, but indicates that the claims would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. Applicants have amended claim 1 to include limitations from dependent claims 12 and 13. Moreover, claims 14 and 15 have been placed into independent form and include limitations of claims 1 and 12. Claim 18 has been amended to include limitations from claims 29 and 32 and claim 30 has been placed into independent form and includes the limitations of claims 18 and 29. Claim 35 has been amended to include limitations from claims 46 and 48. Claim 47 has been placed into independent form to include the limitations of claims 35 and 46.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the allowability of the pending claims.

#### ***Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103***

Claims 1-3, 5, 10-12, 17-20 22, 27-29, 34-37, 39, 44-46 and 51 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Anderson (U.S. Patent No. 6,912,311) in view of Shimori (U.S. Patent No. 6,567,983). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection because a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established. However, based on the amendments of independent claims 1, 18 and 35 described above, Applicants respectfully submit that the outstanding §103(a) rejection has been traversed.

Claims 4, 21 and 38 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anderson in view of Shimori and Rissman (U.S. Patent No. 6,552,743). Also, claims 6-7, 23-24 and 40-41 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anderson in view of Shimori and Enomoto (U.S. Patent No. 6,313,902). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections based on a lack of a *prima facie* case of obviousness. Based on the lack of a *prima facie* case of obviousness, and the fact that claims 4, 6-7, 21, 23-34, 38 and 40-41 are dependent on independent claims 1, 18 and 35, believed by Applicants to be in condition for allowance, no further discussion as to the grounds for traverse is warranted. Applicants reserve the right to present such arguments in an Appeal is warranted. Withdrawal of the §103(a) rejection as applied to claims 4, 6-7, 21, 23-34, 38 and 40-41 is respectfully requested.

***Telephonic Interview***

Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to contact the undersigned attorney if, after review of the Amendment, the pending claims are not in condition for allowance. The undersigned attorney may be reached at the phone number listed below.

***Conclusion***

Applicants respectfully request that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Dated: March 31, 2006

By

  
William W. Schaaf

Reg. No. 39,018

Tel.: (714) 557-3800 (Pacific Coast)

12400 Wilshire Boulevard, Seventh Floor  
Los Angeles, California 90025

---

**CERTIFICATE OF MAILING/TRANSMISSION (37 CFR 1.84)**

*I hereby certify that this correspondence is, on the date shown below, being:*

**MAILING**

☒ deposited with the United States Postal Service  
as first class mail in an envelope addressed to:  
Commissioner for Patents, PO Box 1450,  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

Date: 3/31/2006

**FACSIMILE**

☐ transmitted by facsimile to the Patent and  
Trademark Office.

  
Susan McFarlane

3/31/2006

Date